

# **BAYOU CHENE TMDL FOR DISSOLVED OXYGEN**

April 19, 2002

BAYOU CHENE TMDL  
FOR DISSOLVED OXYGEN

SUBSEGMENT 050603

Prepared for

US EPA Region 6  
Water Quality Protection Division  
Watershed Management Section

Contract No. 68-C-99-249  
Work Assignment #1-67

Prepared by

FTN Associates, Ltd.  
3 Innwood Circle, Suite 220  
Little Rock, AR 72211

April 19, 2002

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires states to identify waterbodies that are not meeting water quality standards and to develop total maximum daily pollutant loads for those waterbodies. A total maximum daily load (TMDL) is the amount of pollutant that a waterbody can assimilate without exceeding the established water quality standard for that pollutant. Through a TMDL, pollutant loads can be distributed or allocated to point sources and nonpoint sources (NPS) discharging to the waterbody. This report presents a TMDL that has been developed for dissolved oxygen (DO) for Bayou Chene (Subsegment 050603).

Bayou Chene is located in the Mermentau River basin in southern Louisiana. The watershed is approximately 134 mi<sup>2</sup> in size and has little relief. The lower end of Bayou Chene is affected by backwater from the Gulf of Mexico and occasionally experiences reverse flows. The primary land use in the watershed is agriculture, particularly rice and soybeans. Irrigation of rice and other crops has a significant impact on water quality in this area. There are few point source discharges in this subsegment.

Bayou Chene (Subsegment 050603) was listed on the Modified Court Ordered 303(d) List for Louisiana as not fully supporting the designated use of propagation of fish and wildlife and was ranked as priority #1 for TMDL development. This subsegment was not included on the 1998 303(d) List, but was later added to the list based on Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) assessment data collected during June – December 1998. The cause for impairment cited in the 303(d) List was organic enrichment/low DO. Although the water quality standard for DO in the surrounding subsegments has been changed to 3 mg/L for March - November and 5 mg/L for December - February, the current water quality standard for DO in Bayou Chene is still 5 mg/L year round.

A water quality model (LA-QUAL) was set up to simulate DO, CBOD, ammonia nitrogen, and organic nitrogen. The model was calibrated using data from FTN's synoptic survey in September 2000, LDEQ assessment data collected during June – December 1998, and other various information obtained from LDEQ and United States Geological Survey (USGS). There

---

were no intensive survey data available for this subsegment. The projection simulation was run at critical flows and temperatures to address seasonality as required by the Clean Water Act.

Reductions of existing nonpoint source loads were required for the projection simulation to show the current DO standard of 5 mg/L being maintained. In general, the modeling in this study was consistent with guidance in the Louisiana TMDL Technical Procedures Manual. A TMDL for oxygen demanding substances (CBOD, ammonia nitrogen, organic nitrogen, and sediment oxygen demand) was calculated using the results of the projection simulation. Both implicit and explicit margins of safety were included in the TMDL calculations.

The TMDL for this subsegment includes a wasteload allocation for the point sources with minor oxygen demanding discharges within the subsegment. No treatment upgrades are recommended because the only oxygen demanding point source discharges are small and have little impact on the DO in Bayou Chene. An average nonpoint source reduction of 58% is required to meet the current water quality standard for DO. Required nonpoint source reductions for individual reaches in the model were as high as 70%. The current DO standard of 5 mg/L for this subsegment would require nonpoint source load reductions that would probably not be achievable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1-1
2.0 STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION .....	2-1
2.1 General Information .....	2-1
2.2 Water Quality Standards .....	2-2
2.3 Identification of Sources .....	2-2
2.3.1 Point Sources .....	2-2
2.3.2 Nonpoint Sources .....	2-3
2.4 Previous Data and Studies .....	2-3
3.0 CALIBRATION OF WATER QUALITY MODEL .....	3-1
3.1 Model Setup .....	3-1
3.2 Calibration Period .....	3-1
3.3 Temperature Correction of Kinetics (Data Type 4) .....	3-2
3.4 Hydraulics and Dispersion (Data Types 9 and 10) .....	3-2
3.5 Initial Conditions (Data Type 11) .....	3-3
3.6 Water Quality Kinetics (Data Types 12 and 13) .....	3-4
3.7 Nonpoint Source Loads (Data Type 19) .....	3-5
3.8 Headwater and Tributary Flow Rates (Data Types 20 and 24) .....	3-5
3.9 Headwater and Tributary Water Quality (Data Types 21 and 25) .....	3-5
3.10 Point Source Inputs (Data Types 24 and 25) .....	3-6
3.11 Lower Boundary Condition (Data Type 27) .....	3-6
3.12 Calibration Methodology .....	3-7
3.13 Model Results for Calibration .....	3-7
4.0 WATER QUALITY MODEL PROJECTION .....	4-1
4.1 Identification of Critical Conditions .....	4-1
4.2 Temperature Inputs .....	4-2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

4.3	Headwater and Tributary Inputs . . . . .	4-3
4.4	Point Source Inputs . . . . .	4-3
4.5	Nonpoint Source Loads . . . . .	4-4
4.6	Downstream Boundary . . . . .	4-4
4.7	Other Inputs . . . . .	4-4
4.8	Model Results for Projection . . . . .	4-4
5.0	TMDL CALCULATIONS . . . . .	5-1
5.1	DO TMDL . . . . .	5-1
5.2	Summary of NPS Reductions . . . . .	5-2
5.3	Seasonal Variation . . . . .	5-2
5.4	Margin of Safety . . . . .	5-2
6.0	SENSITIVITY ANALYSES . . . . .	6-1
7.0	OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION . . . . .	7-1
8.0	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION . . . . .	8-1
9.0	REFERENCES . . . . .	9-1

## LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Map of Study Area
APPENDIX B:	Minor Point Source Discharges in the Study Area
APPENDIX C:	Vector Diagram for LA-QUAL Model
APPENDIX D:	LDEQ and FTN Water Quality Data
APPENDIX E:	Model Input Data and Sources for Calibration
APPENDIX F:	Plots of Predicted and Observed Water Quality
APPENDIX G:	Printout of Model Output for Calibration
APPENDIX H:	Model Input Data and Sources for Projection
APPENDIX I:	Plots of Predicted Water Quality for Projection
APPENDIX J:	Printout of Model Output for Projection
APPENDIX K:	TMDL Calculations
APPENDIX L:	Responses to Comments

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Summary of 303(d) Listing of the 4 subsegments in the study area . . . . .	1-1
Table 2.1	Land uses in the study area based on GAP data . . . . .	2-1
Table 2.2	Water quality standards and designated uses . . . . .	2-2
Table 5.1	DO TMDL for Subsegment 050603 . . . . .	5-1
Table 6.1	Summary of results of sensitivity analyses . . . . .	6-2

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for dissolved oxygen (DO) for Bayou Chene (Subsegment 050603). This subsegment was listed on the February 29, 2000 Modified Court Ordered 303(d) List for Louisiana (EPA 2000) as not fully supporting the designated use of propagation of fish and wildlife. This subsegment was not included on the 1998 303(d) List (LDEQ 1998a), but was later added to the list based on LDEQ assessment data collected during June – December 1998. The suspected sources and suspected causes for impairment in the 303(d) List are included in Table 1.1. This subsegment was ranked as priority #1 for TMDL development. The TMDL in this report was developed in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act and EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 130.7.

The purpose of a TMDL is to determine the pollutant loading that a waterbody can assimilate without exceeding the water quality standard for that pollutant and to establish the load reduction that is necessary to meet the standard in a waterbody. The TMDL is the sum of the wasteload allocation (WLA), the load allocation (LA), and a margin of safety (MOS). The WLA is the load allocated to point sources of the pollutant of concern, and the LA is the load allocated to NPS. The MOS is a percentage of the TMDL that accounts for the uncertainty associated with the model assumptions, data inadequacies, and future growth.

Table 1.1. Summary of 303(d) Listing of the 4 subsegments in the study area (EPA 2000).

<b>Subsegment Number</b>	<b>Waterbody Description</b>	<b>Suspected Sources</b>	<b>Suspected Causes</b>	<b>Priority Ranking (1 = highest)</b>
050603	Bayou Chene including Bayou Grand Marais	None stated	Organic enrichment/low DO	1



## 2.0 STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 General Information

Bayou Chene is located in the Mermentau River basin in southern Louisiana (see map in Appendix A). The watershed is approximately 134 mi<sup>2</sup> in size and has little relief. The watershed drains generally southward and then westward into Bayou Lacassine. The lower end of Bayou Chene is affected by backwater from the Gulf of Mexico and occasionally experiences reverse flows. Additional information concerning the hydraulics of the Lower Mermentau basin can be found in the Bayou Lacassine TMDL report (FTN 2000a) and in the Lake Arthur/Grand Lake/GIWW draft TMDL report (FTN 2001).

The primary land use in the watershed is agriculture, particularly rice and soybeans. After harvest, some rice fields are flooded and crawfish are raised in those fields. Irrigation of rice and other crops is considered by LDEQ to have a significant impact on water quality in this area. Land use data for the Bayou Chene subsegment is shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Land uses in the study area based on GAP data (USGS 1998).

Land Use Type	% of Total Area
Urban	3.1
Agriculture	90.6
Upland Scrub	0.2
Upland Forest	1.0
Water	1.9
Freshwater marsh	0.3
Wetland Scrub	0.6
Wetland Forest	2.1
Barren	0.1
Total	100.0

## 2.2 Water Quality Standards

The numeric water quality standards and designated uses for the Bayou Chene subsegment are shown in Table 2.2. The primary numeric standard for the TMDLs presented in this report is the DO standard of 5 mg/L year round.

A DO use attainability analysis (UAA) for the Mermentau River Basin was performed by LDEQ to provide the basis for a revision to the DO criteria for streams in the Mermentau River basin (LDEQ 1998b). The DO criteria recommended in this UAA were adopted as the water quality standards for most of the basin. Bayou Chene, however, was inadvertently omitted from the list of streams whose DO standards were set to 3 mg/L for March – November and 5 mg/L for December – February. Therefore, the current water quality standard for DO for Bayou Chene is still 5 mg/L year round. At the time of the next water quality standards revisions, the DO standard for Bayou Chene will likely be changed to the seasonal standards of 3 mg/L and 5 mg/L.

Table 2.2. Water quality standards and designated uses (LDEQ 2000a).

Subsegment	050603
Stream Description	Bayou Chene – Headwaters to Bayou Lacassine
Designated Uses	ABCF
Criteria:	
Chloride	90 mg/L
Sulfate	10 mg/L
DO	5 mg/L (year round)
pH	6.5 – 9.0
Temperature	32 °C
TDS	400 mg/L

USES: A – primary contact recreation; B – secondary contact recreation; C – propagation of fish and wildlife; F – agriculture.

## 2.3 Identification of Sources

### 2.3.1 Point Sources

A list of NPDES permits that were identified in or near the Bayou Chene subsegment is included in Appendix B. These permits were identified by searching two sources of information. The primary source was a listing of all the permits in the Mermentau basin (basin number 05) from the LDEQ static database. The secondary source was a listing of all the permits in the

Mermentau basin (hydrologic units 08080101 and 08080102) from EPA's Permit Compliance System (PCS) on the EPA website. All of the information concerning permit parameters and design flow in Appendix B was obtained by manually retrieving hard copies of permit files from LDEQ's file room.

Facilities without oxygen demanding parameters in their permit were assumed to exert a negligible oxygen demand in the receiving stream; therefore, these facilities were excluded from any further consideration in this TMDL. The one facility with oxygen demanding parameters in its permit was included in the TMDL calculations, but was not considered large enough to be modeled explicitly (i.e., flow <0.002 cfs). Therefore, the oxygen demanding discharges were included in the model implicitly by considering their oxygen demand as part of the nonpoint source loading into the system.

### **2.3.2 Nonpoint Sources**

Although there were no suspected sources of impairment specified for Bayou Chene on the 303(d) List (Table 1.1), NPS have been specified on the 303(d) List for nearby subsegments. The NPS for nearby subsegments include non-irrigated crop production, irrigated crop production, and unknown sources.

## **2.4 Previous Data and Studies**

Listed below are previous water quality data and studies in or near the Bayou Chene subsegment. Locations of selected water quality monitoring stations are shown in Appendix A.

1. Twice monthly data collected by LDEQ for "Bayou Chene" (station 0658) for mid-June to December 1998. This station is located at the Highway 99 bridge.
2. Monthly data collected by LDEQ for "Bayou Lacassine near Lake Arthur, Louisiana" (station 0098) for March 1978 to December 1998. This station is located at the Highway 14 bridge downstream of the Bayou Chene confluence.

3. DO TMDL for Bayou Lacassine (FTN 2000a).
4. Dissolved Oxygen Use Attainability Analysis for the Mermentau River Basin (LDEQ 1998b).

### **3.0 CALIBRATION OF WATER QUALITY MODEL**

#### **3.1 Model Setup**

In order to evaluate the linkage between pollutant sources and water quality, a computer simulation model was used. The model used for this TMDL was LA-QUAL (version 3.02), which was selected because it includes the relevant physical, chemical, and biological processes and it has been used successfully in the past for other TMDLs in Louisiana. The LA-QUAL model was set up to simulate organic nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, ultimate carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (CBOD<sub>u</sub>), and DO. Phosphorus and algae were not simulated because algae do not appear to have significant impacts on DO in this subsegment.

A vector diagram of the model is shown in Appendix C. The vector diagram shows the reach/element design and the location of the modeled inflows. The model consists of one “branch” with several inflows from tributaries. To keep the model simple, tributaries with drainage areas smaller than 10 mi<sup>2</sup> were not included in the model. The model was divided into multiple reaches to allow for variations in depth and width as well as nonpoint source loading.

#### **3.2 Calibration Period**

An intensive field survey was not performed for the study area due to schedule and budget limitations. A synoptic survey of the study area was performed by FTN in September 2000. During the synoptic survey, data were collected at 3 locations (shown in Appendix A). Historical water quality data were available at only one location (LDEQ station 0658) for a 6 month period (June through December 1998). The water quality data from the FTN synoptic survey and from LDEQ’s historical ambient monitoring are summarized in Appendix D.

Based on the synoptic survey (Appendix D), the DO in Bayou Chene appears to exhibit some differences between the upper and lower ends of the stream (i.e., 6 mg/L at station 658-3 compared to 1.2 mg/L at station 658-1). It was important to ensure that this DO variation in Bayou Chene was incorporated into the model. Therefore, the synoptic survey data was used as

the calibration data set since it includes data from 3 locations on Bayou Chene, as opposed to the single location for the LDEQ data set.

The water quality data collected at the Highway 99 bridge during the synoptic survey were similar to values collected by LDEQ at the same location during late summer/early fall 1998 (which has been considered a critical period in the lower Mermentau basin for other TMDLs). This confirmed that the September 2000 synoptic survey was performed during critical conditions. The purpose of selecting a critical period for calibration is so that the model will be calibrated as accurately as possible for making projection simulations for critical conditions.

Because data were collected at several stations and the data were collected during a critical period for DO, the September 2000 synoptic survey was selected as the calibration period.

### **3.3 Temperature Correction of Kinetics (Data Type 4)**

The temperature correction factors used in the model were consistent with the Louisiana Technical Procedures Manual (the “LTP”; LDEQ 2000b). These correction factors were:

- Correction for BOD decay: 1.047 (value in LTP is same as model default)
- Correction for SOD: 1.065 (value in LTP is same as model default)
- Correction for reaeration: 1.024 (specified in Data Group 4)
- Correction for ammonia N decay: 1.070 (specified in Data Group 4)
- Correction for organic N decay: 1.020 (not specified in LTP; model default used)

### **3.4 Hydraulics and Dispersion (Data Types 9 and 10)**

The hydraulics were specified in the input for the LA-QUAL model using the power functions ( $\text{width} = a * Q^b + c$  and  $\text{depth} = d * Q^e + f$ ).

Because the flows during the September 2000 synoptic survey were similar to the flows that would be used in the projection simulation, it was assumed that depths and widths would not change significantly between the calibration and the projection. Therefore, the system was modeled with constant depth and width (i.e., independent of flow rate). This was specified in the model by setting the coefficients and exponents as follows (values for each reach are shown in Appendix E):

- width coefficient (a) = width based on field measurements
- width exponent (b) = 0.0
- width constant (c) = 0.0
- depth coefficient (d) = depth based on field measurements
- depth exponent (e) = 0.0
- depth constant (f) = 0.0

The widths and depths for each reach were based on field measurements at 3 locations during the September 2000 synoptic survey. The measured data and the model input values are plotted in Appendix E. Widths along the lower end of Bayou Chene were verified by checking topographic maps and aerial photos.

Longitudinal dispersion is known to affect water quality in the lower end of Bayou Chene because reverse flows have been observed in Bayou Chene (e.g., during the Bayou Lacassine intensive surveys in 1999). Also, longitudinal dispersion was included in the Bayou Lacassine TMDL model (FTN 2000a) at the mouth of Bayou Chene. Therefore, the Bayou Lacassine tidal dispersion coefficient at the confluence with Bayou Chene (8 ft<sup>2</sup>/s) was used for the downstream-most reach in the Bayou Chene model. Dispersion was not specified for other reaches in Bayou Chene based on observations during the synoptic survey.

### **3.5 Initial Conditions (Data Type 11)**

The primary parameter that was specified in the initial conditions for LA-QUAL was the temperature for each reach (because temperature was not being simulated). The temperature for all reaches was set to the average of the measured values at the 3 stations in the September 2000 synoptic survey. The input data and sources are shown in Appendix E.

For constituents not being simulated, the initial concentrations were set to zero; otherwise, the model would have assumed a fixed concentration of those constituents and the model would have included the effects of the unmodeled constituents on the modeled constituents (e.g., the effects of algae on DO).

### **3.6 Water Quality Kinetics (Data Types 12 and 13)**

Kinetic rates used in LA-QUAL include reaeration rates, sediment oxygen demand (SOD), CBOD decay rates, nitrification rates, and mineralization rates (organic nitrogen decay). The values used in the model input are shown in Appendix E.

The Louisiana Equation option was specified for reaeration in the model. The SOD rates were developed through iteration in the calibration. The SOD rate for each reach was adjusted so that predicted DO concentrations were similar to the calibration target values. The CBOD decay rate was set to 0.10/day based on LDEQ's guidance for uncalibrated modeling of the Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche basins (LDEQ 2000c) and information in the "Rates, Constants, and Kinetics" publication (EPA 1985).

Mineralization rates in the model were set to 0.02/day for all reaches. This value was based on information in the "Rates, Constants, and Kinetics" publication (EPA 1985). Nitrification rates were set to 0.10/day for all reaches, which is consistent with guidance in the LTP based on stream depth. The combination of these rates is consistent with LDEQ's guidance for uncalibrated modeling of the Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche basins (LDEQ 2000c). The LDEQ guidance specified a default rate of 0.05/day for nitrogenous biochemical oxygen demand (NBOD) decay, which represents the combination of mineralization and nitrification.

One other input value was specified for characterizing the nitrification process. In the program constants section of the model input file (data type 3), the nitrification inhibition option was set to 1 instead of the default of option number 2. Option number 1 was also used in the model of Bayou Lacassine (FTN 2000a), which is similar to the system being simulated here. With the default option, the nitrification rate drops rapidly when the DO drops below 2 mg/L, which results in an unrealistic build up of ammonia nitrogen at low DO values such as those in Bayou Chene. Option number 1 provides nitrification inhibition that is similar to what is used in other water quality models such as QUAL2E and WASP (see Figure 3.5 in Bayou Lacassine report).



### **3.7 Nonpoint Source Loads (Data Type 19)**

The NPS loads that are specified in the model can be most easily understood as resuspended load from the bottom sediments and are modeled as SOD, benthic ammonia source rates, CBOD loads, and organic nitrogen loads. The SOD (specified in data type 12), the benthic ammonia source rates (specified in data type 13), and the mass loads of organic nitrogen and CBODu (specified in data type 19) were all treated as calibration parameters; their values were adjusted until the model output was similar to the calibration target values. The procedures used for calibrating the model are discussed in Section 3.12. The values used as model input are shown in Appendix E.

### **3.8 Headwater and Tributary Flow Rates (Data Types 20 and 24)**

Headwater flow was estimated using field measurements of stream velocity, depth and width at station 658-3 during the September 2000 synoptic survey. To keep the model simple inflows were assigned to only a few major tributaries (i.e., drainage areas  $>10$  mi<sup>2</sup>). The tributaries included in the model were Gum Gully, Middle and West Bayou Grand Marais (combined), and Keystone Ditch. The headwater flow was divided by the estimated watershed area to obtain an areal flow (i.e., flow per unit area). This areal flow was multiplied by the estimated watershed area for Gum Gully to estimate flow for Gum Gully. The flow for the Middle Bayou Grand Marais plus East Bayou Grand Marais tributary was set to the flow estimated from width, depth, and velocity measurements at station 658-2. This flow was also converted to an areal flow and used to estimate a flow for the Keystone Ditch tributary. Calculations are included in Appendix E.

### **3.9 Headwater and Tributary Water Quality (Data Types 21 and 25)**

Concentrations of DO, CBODu, organic nitrogen, and ammonia nitrogen were specified in the model for each headwater and tributary inflow. The values used as model input are shown in Appendix E.

Headwater temperature and DO were set to values measured at station 658-3 during the September 2000 synoptic survey. Other water quality constituents were not measured at

---

station 658-3. Concentrations measured at station 658-2 were used as the headwater concentrations. Headwater CBOD<sub>u</sub> and organic nitrogen concentrations were calculated from CBOD<sub>5</sub> and TKN measured at station 658-2. The K<sub>d</sub> values calculated for several stations in the Bayou Lacassine TMDL study were used to calculate a CBOD<sub>5</sub>:CBOD<sub>u</sub> ratio. Using the average K<sub>d</sub> (0.75) in the equation  $1 \div (1 - e^{-5 * K_d})$ , the CBOD<sub>5</sub>:CBOD<sub>u</sub> ratio was calculated to be 3.1. Organic nitrogen was estimated as TKN minus ammonia nitrogen.

The water quality for Gum Gully and Middle and East Bayou Grand Marais Bayou were the same. Water quality measured at station 658-2 during the September 2000 synoptic survey were used for both. Water quality data from station 658-1 during the synoptic survey was used for Keystone Ditch. CBOD<sub>u</sub> was estimated from CBOD<sub>5</sub> and organic nitrogen was estimated from TKN as specified above.

### **3.10 Point Source Inputs (Data Types 24 and 25)**

No point sources were modeled explicitly in the Bayou Chene model. Loads from Welsh/Roanoke Junior High School were implicitly included in the nonpoint loads specified for the model.

### **3.11 Lower Boundary Condition (Data Type 27)**

Because longitudinal dispersion was explicitly specified in data type 9, the model required input values for downstream boundary conditions. The lower boundary conditions were assumed to be equivalent to the measurements taken at station BL-1 during the August 1999 Bayou Lacassine synoptic survey. This is the closest available water quality data for Bayou Lacassine, which is the downstream boundary of Bayou Chene. The values used as model input are shown in Appendix E.

### **3.12 Calibration Methodology**

The model was calibrated by adjusting 4 input parameters: organic nitrogen loads, benthic ammonia source rates, CBOD mass loads, and SOD. First, the organic nitrogen loads were adjusted until the predicted organic nitrogen concentrations were similar to the observed

---

concentrations. Organic nitrogen was calibrated first because none of the other state variables (DO, CBOD, ammonia nitrogen) will affect the organic nitrogen concentrations. Next, the benthic ammonia source rates were adjusted until the predicted ammonia nitrogen concentrations were similar to the observed concentrations. Then the CBOD loads were adjusted until the predicted CBOD concentrations were similar to the observed concentrations. Finally, SOD was adjusted until the predicted DO concentrations were similar to the observed concentrations.

### **3.13 Model Results for Calibration**

Plots of predicted and observed water quality for the calibration are presented in Appendix F and a printout of the LA-QUAL output file is included as Appendix G. The calibration is considered to be acceptable based on the amount of data that were available.

SOD values used in the calibration for Bayou Chene were low compared to values used in the calibration for Bayou Lacassine (FTN 2000a) but similar to values used in the calibration for the Mermentau River (LDEQ 1999). The total oxygen demanding load for Bayou Chene (the sum of oxygen demand from SOD, CBOD<sub>u</sub>, ammonia nitrogen, and organic nitrogen) was similar to the total loads in the Bayou Lacassine and Mermentau River TMDLs.

## **4.0 WATER QUALITY MODEL PROJECTION**

EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 require the determination of TMDLs to take into account critical conditions for stream flow, loading, and water quality parameters. Therefore, the calibrated model was used to project water quality for critical conditions. The identification of critical conditions and the model input data used for critical conditions are discussed below.

### **4.1 Identification of Critical Conditions**

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act and EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 both require the consideration of seasonal variation of conditions affecting the constituent of concern and the inclusion of a MOS in the development of a TMDL. For the TMDLs in this report, analyses of LDEQ long-term ambient data were used to determine critical seasonal conditions. A combination of implicit and explicit MOSs was used in developing the projection model.

Critical conditions for DO have been determined for the Mermentau basin in previous TMDL studies. The analyses concluded that the critical conditions for stream DO concentrations occur during periods with negligible nonpoint runoff, low stream flow, and high stream temperature.

When the rainfall runoff (and nonpoint loading) and stream flow are high, turbulence is higher due to the higher flow and the stream temperature is lowered by the cooler precipitation and runoff. In addition, runoff coefficients are higher in cooler weather due to reduced evaporation and evapotranspiration, so that the high flow periods of the year tend to be the cooler periods. DO saturation values are, of course, much higher when water temperatures are cooler, but BOD decay rates are much lower. For these reasons, periods of high loading are periods of higher reaeration and DO but not necessarily periods of high BOD decay.

LDEQ interprets this phenomenon in its TMDL modeling by assuming that the annual nonpoint loading, rather than loading for any particular day, is responsible for the accumulated benthic blanket of the stream, which is, in turn, expressed as SOD and/or resuspended BOD in

the model. This accumulated loading has its greatest impact on the stream during periods of higher temperature and lower flow.

According to the LTP, critical summer conditions in DO TMDL projection modeling are simulated by using the annual 7Q10 flow or 0.1 cfs, whichever is higher, for all headwaters, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile temperature for the summer season. Model loading is from point sources, perennial tributaries, SOD, and resuspension of sediments. In addition, all point sources are assumed to be discharging at design capacity.

In reality, the highest temperatures occur in July-August, the lowest stream flows occur in October-November, and the maximum point source discharge occurs following a significant rainfall, i.e., high-flow conditions. The combination of these conditions plus the impact of other conservative assumptions regarding rates and loadings yields an implicit MOS that is not quantified. Over and above this implicit MOS, an explicit MOS of 20% for point sources and 10% for NPS was incorporated into the TMDL in this report to account for future growth and model uncertainty.

## **4.2 Temperature Inputs**

The LTP (LDEQ 2000b) specified that the critical temperature should be determined by calculating the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile seasonal temperature for the waterbody being modeled. Because the LDEQ station in the study area has only 6 months of data, LDEQ data from other subsegments were used for this analysis. In the Bayou Lacassine TMDL (FTN 2000a), long term temperature data from Bayou Lacassine at Highway 14 (LDEQ station 0098) were used to calculate a 90<sup>th</sup> percentile summer temperature of 30.0°C. The water temperatures for the Bayou Lacassine station during June through December 1998 were similar to Bayou Chene water temperatures during the same period (29.8°C in Bayou Lacassine compared to 29.1°C in Bayou Chene). Bayou Lacassine water temperature was specified in data type 11 in the model input shown in Appendix H.

Because the Bayou Chene subsegment currently has a year round standard for DO, a winter projection simulation was not performed. As discussed above, the most critical time of

year for meeting a constant DO standard is the period of high temperatures and low flows (i.e., summer).

### **4.3 Headwater and Tributary Inputs**

The inputs for the headwaters and tributaries for the projection simulation were based on guidance in the LTP as well as output from the projection model of Bayou Lacassine (in previously completed TMDLs). According to the LTP, the critical flow rates for summer should be set to either the 7Q10 flow or 0.1 cfs, whichever is higher. Also, the LTP specifies that the DO concentration for headwater and tributary inflows should be set to 90% saturation at the critical temperature. The values used as model input in the projection simulation are shown in Appendix H.

7Q10 flows for the headwater and tributaries were estimated from 7Q10 flow reported for Bayou Wikoff. Bayou Wikoff is located near the Bayou Chene subsegment and has a drainage area of similar size to the headwaters. Bayou Wikoff was used to estimate 7Q10 flows for the Bayou Lacassine TMDL study. An areal flow was calculated by dividing the reported 7Q10 flow for Bayou Wikoff by the drainage area for the Bayou Wikoff gaging station. This areal 7Q10 flow was then multiplied by the drainage areas reported or estimated for the headwaters and the tributaries (see Appendix H for calculations). All of these estimated 7Q10 flows for Bayou Chene and its tributaries were less than 0.1 cfs. Therefore, 0.1 cfs was used in the projection run for the Bayou Grand Marais headwater flow and for each tributary flow (Gum Gully, Middle and East Bayou Grand Marais, and Keystone Ditch).

### **4.4 Point Source Inputs**

Because there were no point source discharges being explicitly modeled, there were no point source input values specified in the projection simulation.

### **4.5 Nonpoint Source Loads**

Because the initial projection simulation was showing low DO values in a number of the reaches, the NPS loadings were reduced until all of the predicted DO values were equal to or

---

greater than the water quality standard of 5.0 mg/L. Within each reach, the same percent reduction was applied to all components of the nonpoint source loads (SOD, mass loads of CBODu and organic nitrogen). The values used as model input in the projection simulation are shown in Appendix H.

#### **4.6 Downstream Boundary**

For the projection simulation, the downstream boundary condition for temperature was set to the same as the critical temperature for Bayou Chene. This was done so that the model would not change the temperature that was specified for Bayou Chene. For DO, the downstream boundary condition was set to the water quality standard (5.0 mg/L) so that the model would not simulate a DO sink due to dispersion with the downstream boundary. The rest of the downstream water quality was set to the values from the Bayou Lacassine projection model element 102 (the confluence with Bayou Chene). The values used as model input in the projection simulation are shown in Appendix H.

#### **4.7 Other Inputs**

The only model inputs that were changed from the calibration to the projection simulation were the inputs discussed above in Sections 4.2 through 4.6. All of the other model inputs (e.g., hydraulic and dispersion coefficients, decay rates, reaeration rates, etc.) were unchanged from the calibration simulation.

#### **4.8 Model Results for Projection**

Plots of predicted water quality for the projection are presented in Appendix I and a printout of the LA-QUAL output file is included as Appendix J.

No NPS load reductions were required above river mile 17. NPS load reductions of 35% - 70% were required to bring the predicted DO values to at least 5.0 mg/L in the stream below river mile 17. These percentage reductions for NPS loads represent percentages of the entire NPS loading, not percentages of the manmade NPS loading. The NPS loads in this report were not divided between natural and manmade because it would be difficult to estimate natural NPS

loads for Bayou Chene. There are no LDEQ reference streams in the lower Mermentau basin. In previous TMDLs on nearby waterbodies, the percentage of total NPS loading that was estimated to be manmade varied from 36% for Bayou Lacassine (FTN 2000a) to 73% for the Mermentau River (LDEQ 1999).



## 5.0 TMDL CALCULATIONS

### 5.1 DO TMDL

A TMDL for DO has been calculated for subsegment 050603 based on the results of the projection simulation. The DO TMDL is presented as oxygen demand from CBOD<sub>u</sub>, NBOD (decay of organic nitrogen and ammonia nitrogen), and SOD. A summary of the loads is presented in Table 5.1. The calculations are included as Appendix K.

Table 5.1. DO TMDL for Subsegment 050603.

	Oxygen demand (kg/day) from:			Total oxygen demand (kg/day)
	CBOD <sub>u</sub>	NBOD	SOD	
WLA for minor point sources	4	3	n.a.	7
MOS for minor point sources	1	1	n.a.	2
LA for headwater	214	52	n.a.	266
LA for NPS	798	52	286	1136
MOS for all NPS	160	10	57	227
Total maximum daily load	1177	118	343	1638

The NBOD loads were calculated as 4.33 times the sum of organic nitrogen and ammonia nitrogen (assuming that all organic nitrogen is eventually converted to ammonia). The value of 4.33 is the same ratio of oxygen demand to nitrogen that is used by the LA-QUAL model. For the SOD loads, a temperature correction factor was included in the calculations (in order to be consistent with LDEQ procedures).

The WLA for the minor point sources represents the loads from the small oxygen demanding discharge (Welsh-Roanoke Junior High) that was not explicitly modeled. This WLA was based on current permit limits with no reductions. The effluent concentration for ammonia nitrogen was assumed based on the BOD<sub>5</sub> permit limit and typical combinations of BOD<sub>5</sub> and ammonia nitrogen listed in the LTP (LDEQ 2000b).

Because the WLA for the minor point source represented a load that was not simulated in the model, this load was subtracted from the total NPS load that was simulated in the model. Therefore, the LA for NPS was calculated as 90% of the NPS load simulated in the model minus the WLA and MOS for the minor point source. The other 10% of the NPS load simulated in the model was designated as an explicit MOS for NPS.

## **5.2 Summary of NPS Reductions**

In summary, the projection modeling used to develop the TMDL above showed that NPS loads need to be reduced by an average of 58% to maintain the current DO standard of 5 mg/L year round.

## **5.3 Seasonal Variation**

As discussed in Section 4.1, critical conditions for DO in Louisiana waterbodies have been determined to be when there is negligible nonpoint runoff and low stream flow combined with high water temperature. In addition, the model accounts for loadings that occur at higher flows by modeling sediment oxygen demand. Oxygen demanding pollutants that enter the waterbodies during higher flows settle to the bottom and then exert the greatest oxygen demand during the high temperature seasons.

## **5.4 Margin of Safety**

The MOS accounts for any lack of knowledge or uncertainty concerning the relationship between LA and water quality. As discussed in Section 4.1, the highest temperatures occur in July through August, the lowest stream flows occur in October through November, and the maximum point source discharge occurs following a significant rainfall, i.e., high-flow conditions. The combination of these conditions, in addition to other conservative assumptions regarding rates and loadings, yields an implicit MOS that is not quantified. In addition to the implicit MOS, the TMDL in this report included explicit MOS of 20% for point source loads and 10% for nonpoint source loads.

## 6.0 SENSITIVITY ANALYSES

All modeling studies necessarily involve uncertainty and some degree of approximation. It is therefore of value to consider the sensitivity of the model output to changes in model coefficients, and in the hypothesized relationship among the parameters of the model. The LA-QUAL model allows multiple parameters to be varied with a single run. The model adjusts each parameter up or down by the percentage given in the input set. The rest of the parameters listed in the sensitivity section are held at their original projection value. Thus the sensitivity of each parameter is reviewed separately. The sensitivity analysis was performed on the projection simulation. The percent change of the model's minimum DO projections to each parameter is presented in Table 6.1. Each parameter was varied by  $\pm 30\%$ , except for temperature, which was varied  $\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ .

Values reported in Table 6.1 are sorted by percentage variation of minimum DO from smallest percentage variation to largest. Reaeration is the parameter to which DO is most sensitive (10% to 22%). The other parameter causing the greatest variations in the minimum DO values is velocity (8% to 14%). The model results are slightly sensitive to temperature, SOD, wasteload BOD, depth, wasteload flow, BOD decay rate, and wasteload DO with variations in predicted DO ranging from 2% to 6%. The model is not sensitive to headwater flow or dispersion.

Table 6.1. Summary of results of sensitivity analyses.

Input Parameter	Parameter Change	Predicted minimum DO (mg/L)	Percent Change in Predicted DO (%)
Baseline	-	5.0	N/A
Dispersion	-30%	5.0	<1
Dispersion	+30%	5.0	<1
Headwater flow	-30%	5.0	<1
Headwater flow	+30%	5.0	<1
SOD	-30%	5.0	<1
Organic N decay rate	-30%	5.0	<1
Organic N decay rate	+30%	5.0	<1
NH3 decay rate	-30%	5.0	<1
NH3 decay rate	+30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load Organic N	-30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load Organic N	+30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load NH3	-30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load NH3	+30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load DO	+30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load BOD	-30%	5.0	<1
Waste Load flow	-30%	5.0	<1
Depth	-30%	5.0	<1
BOD decay rate	+30%	4.9	2
Waste Load DO	-30%	4.9	2
BOD decay rate	-30%	4.9	2
Waste Load flow	+30%	4.9	2
Depth	+30%	4.9	2
Initial Temperature	-2°C	5.2	4
Waste Load BOD	+30%	4.8	4
SOD	+30%	4.7	6
Initial Temperature	+2°C	4.7	6
Velocity	-30%	5.4	8
Reaeration	+30%	5.5	10
Velocity	+30%	4.3	14

---

---

Reaeration	-30%	3.9	22
------------	------	-----	----

## **7.0 OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION**

This TMDL has been developed to be consistent with the antidegradation policy in the LDEQ water quality standards (LAC 33:IX.1109.A).

Although not required by this TMDL, LDEQ utilizes funds under Section 106 of the Federal Clean Water Act and under the authority of the Louisiana Environmental Quality Act to operate an established program for monitoring the quality of the state's surface waters. The LDEQ Surveillance Section collects surface water samples at various locations, utilizing appropriate sampling methods and procedures for ensuring the quality of the data collected. The objectives of the surface water monitoring program are to determine the quality of the state's surface waters, to develop a long-term database for water quality trend analysis, and to monitor the effectiveness of pollution controls. The data obtained through the surface water monitoring program is used to develop the state's biennial 305(b) Report (Water Quality Inventory) and the 303(d) List of impaired waters. This information is also utilized in establishing priorities for the LDEQ nonpoint source program.

The LDEQ has implemented a watershed approach to surface water quality monitoring. Through this approach, the entire state is sampled over a 5-year cycle with two targeted basins sampled each year. Long-term trend monitoring sites at various locations on the larger rivers and Lake Pontchartrain are sampled throughout the 5-year cycle. Sampling is conducted on a monthly basis, or more frequently if necessary, to yield at least 12 samples per site each year. Sampling sites are located where they are considered to be representative of the waterbody. Under the current monitoring schedule, targeted basins follow the TMDL priorities. In this manner, the first TMDLs will have been implemented by the time the first priority basins will be monitored again in the second 5-year cycle. This will allow LDEQ to determine whether there has been any improvement in water quality following establishment of the TMDLs. As the monitoring results are evaluated at the end of each year, waterbodies may be added to or removed from the 303(d) List. The sampling schedule for the first 5-year cycle is shown below. The Mermentau River basin will be sampled again in 2003.

1998 - Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche River Basins  
1999 - Calcasieu and Ouachita River Basins  
2000 - Barataria and Terrebonne Basins  
2001 - Lake Pontchartrain Basin and Pearl River Basin  
2002 - Red and Sabine River Basins

(Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers will be sampled continuously.)

In addition to ambient water quality sampling in the priority basins, the LDEQ has increased compliance monitoring in those basins, following the same schedule. Approximately 1,000 to 1,100 permitted facilities in the priority basins were targeted for inspections. The goal set by LDEQ was to inspect all of those facilities on the list and to sample 1/3 of the minors and 1/3 of the majors. During 1998, 476 compliance evaluation inspections and 165 compliance sampling inspections were conducted throughout the Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche River Basins.

## **8.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

When EPA establishes a TMDL, 40 CFR §130.7(d)(2) requires EPA to publicly notice and seek comment concerning the TMDL. Pursuant to an October 1, 1999 Court Order, this TMDL was prepared under contract to EPA. After submission of this TMDL to the Court, EPA commenced preparation of a notice seeking comments, information, and data from the general and affected public. Comments and additional information were submitted during the public comment period and this Court Ordered TMDL was revised accordingly. Responses to these comments and additional information are included in Appendix L. EPA has transmitted this revised TMDL to the Court and to LDEQ for incorporation into LDEQ's current water quality management plan.



## 9.0 REFERENCES

- EPA. 1985. Rates, Constants, and Kinetics Formulations in Surface Water Quality Modeling (Second Edition). Written by G.L. Bowie et. al. EPA/600/3-85/040. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory, Athens, GA.
- EPA. 2000. Modified Court Ordered 303(d) list for Louisiana. Downloaded from EPA Region 6 website ([www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6wq/ecopro/latmdl/modifiedcourtorderedlist.xls](http://www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6wq/ecopro/latmdl/modifiedcourtorderedlist.xls)).
- FTN. 2000a. Bayou Lacassine Watershed TMDL for Dissolved Oxygen. Prepared for LDEQ by FTN Associates, Ltd., Little Rock, AR: September 2000.
- FTN. 2000b. Lake Fausse Pointe and Dauterive Lake TMDL for Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrients. Prepared for LDEQ by FTN Associates, Ltd., Little Rock, AR: September 2000.
- FTN. 2001. Lake Arthur, Grand Lake, and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway TMDLs for Dissolved Oxygen, nutrients, and Ammonia. Draft report prepared for EPA Region 6 by FTN Associates, Ltd., Little Rock, AR: April 19, 2001.
- LDEQ. 1998a. 1998 305 (b) Appendix C Table. Printed from Louisiana Department of Environment Quality website ([www.deq.state.la.us/planning/305b/1998/305b-ctab.htm](http://www.deq.state.la.us/planning/305b/1998/305b-ctab.htm)).
- LDEQ. 1998b. Dissolved Oxygen Use Attainability Analysis, Mermentau River Basin. Prepared by Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, LA: May, 1998.
- LDEQ. 1999. Mermentau River Watershed TMDL to Address Dissolve Oxygen and Nutrients Including WLAs for Two Treatment Facilities. Written by J. Baker, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, LA: November, 1999.
- LDEQ. 2000a. Environment Regulatory Code. Part IX. Water Quality Regulations. Chapter 11. Surface Water Quality Standards. § 1123. Numerical Criteria and Designated Uses. Printed from LDEQ website ([www.deq.state.la.us/planning/regs/title33/index.htm](http://www.deq.state.la.us/planning/regs/title33/index.htm)).
- LDEQ. 2000b. Louisiana TMDL Technical Procedures Manual. Developed by M.G. Waldon and revised by M.G. Waldon, R.K. Duerr, and M.U. Aguiard. Engineering Group 2, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, LA: September 8, 2000.
- LDEQ. 2000c. "Defaults for uncalibrated modeling". Unpublished 1-page document prepared by Engineering Group 2, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, LA: May 2000.

- Lee, F.N., D. Everett, and M. Forbes. 1997. Lowflow Data for USGS Sites through 1993. Report prepared for LDEQ. March 1997.
- Metcalf and Eddy. 1991. Wastewater Engineering, Treatment, Disposal, Reuse (Third Edition). McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York, NY.
- Smythe, E. deEtte. 1995. Overview of the 1995 Reference Streams. Prepared for Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, LA: August 15, 1997.
- USGS. 1971. Drainage Area of Louisiana Streams. Basic Records Report No. 6. Prepared by US Geological Survey in cooperation with Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development Baton Rouge, LA: 1971 (Reprinted 1991).
- USGS. 1998. Louisiana GAP Land Use/Land Cover Data. Downloaded from Spatial Data and Metadata Server, National Wetlands Research Center, U.S. Geological Survey. (<http://sdms.nwrc.gov/gap/landuse.html>).
- Wiland, B.L., and K. LeBlanc. LA-QUAL for Windows User's Manual, Model Version 3.02, Manual Revision B. Wiland Consulting, Inc. and Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. March 23, 2000.

**APPENDICES A THROUGH K ARE  
AVAILABLE FROM EPA UPON REQUEST**

# **APPENDIX L**

---

## **Responses to Comments**

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES  
BAYOU CHENE  
TMDLs FOR DO AND NUTRIENTS  
April 19, 2002

EPA appreciates all comments concerning these TMDLs. Comments that were received are shown below with EPA responses inserted in a different font.

---

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (LDEQ) (some of these comments may not apply to this report):

In view of LDEQ's TMDL development schedule and the rapidly approaching deadline, LDEQ has made a limited review of the TMDLs published by EPA on October 15, 2001. LDEQ expects to make a more detailed review on at least some of these TMDLs after the first of the year. In the future, LDEQ requests that EPA provide hard copies of the TMDLs and Appendices for LDEQ review. Several electronic files required software which is not used by LDEQ thus making it impossible to review some portions of several TMDLs. Hard copies will insure that the complete official document is being reviewed and will eliminate the time required for LDEQ to try to put together the document from electronic files. In general, LDEQ found these TMDLs to be unacceptable, based on inadequate data and not implementable.

**Federal Register Notice: Volume 66, Number 199, pages 52403 - 52404 (10/15/2001)**

- A. Vermilion River Cutoff DO and Nutrients .pdf
- B. Bayou Chene DO .pdf
- C. Bayou du Portage DO .pdf
- D. Bayou Mallet DO, Nutrients and Ammonia .pdf
- E. Bayou Petite Anse DO and Nutrients .pdf
- F. Bayou Tigre DO and Nutrients .pdf
- G. Big Constance Lake and Mermentau Coastal Bays and Gulf Water TMDLs for DO and Nutrients .pdf
- H. Charenton Drainage and Navigation Canal and West Cote Blanche Bay TMDLs for DO and Nutrients.pdf
- I. Chatlin Lake Canal/Bayou Du Lac and Bayou Des Glaisses Diversion Channel TMDLs for DO and Nutrients.pdf
- J. Dugas Canal DO and Nutrients .pdf
- K. Franklin Canal DO and Nutrients .pdf
- L. Freshwater Bayou Canal DO and Nutrients .pdf
- M. Irish Ditch/Big Bayou DO .pdf

- N. Lake Arthur, Grand Lake, and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway TMDLs for DO, Nutrients, and Ammonia .pdf
- O. Lake Peigneur DO and Nutrients .pdf
- P. New Iberia Southern Drainage Canal DO and Nutrients .pdf
- Q. Spanish Lake DO .pdf
- R. Tete Bayou DO and Nutrients .pdf
- S. Bayou Carron DO and Nutrients .pdf
- T. West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee Borrow Pit Canal DO.pdf

1. Many of these TMDLs are based on models using historical water quality data gathered at a single location rather than survey data gathered at several sites spaced throughout the waterbody. Hydraulic information used was generally not taken at the same time as the water quality data used. The availability of only one water quality data site is not sufficient justification to simulate the subsegment using a one reach, one element model. Additional reaches and elements must be used to represent the subsegment and additional data must be obtained in order for these TMDLs to be valid. The recommended maximum limits cited in the LAQUAL User's Manual for element width and length have been grossly exceeded in many of the models. The spreadsheet calibration and projection graphs that were provided do not match the plots produced by the LA-QUAL model. Please explain why they do not match. The LAQUAL graphics for a few elements produces a graph that does not represent the model output. It's an anomaly of the graphics routine. The calibrations are inadequate due to the lack of a hydrologic calibration and the paucity of water quality data. The resulting TMDLs are invalid. LDEQ does not accept these TMDLs.

Response: The TMDLs were based on existing data plus information that could be obtained with available resources. Each model was developed using the most appropriate hydraulic information and water quality data that were available. The level of detail at which each subsegment was modeled was consistent with the amount of available data. Although having only one element in a model causes inaccuracies in the LAQUAL graphics, having only one element in a model does NOT cause errors in the tabular output (which is what the graphs in the reports are based on). Although LDEQ typically collects more data for model calibration than what was available for calibration of these models, EPA considers these model calibrations and the resulting TMDLs to be valid.

2. LDEQ does not consider any of these waters to be impaired due to nutrients or ammonia. LDEQ does not consider Vermilion River Cutoff (060803), Mermentau Coastal Bays and Gulf Water (050901), Charenton Drainage and Navigation Canal (060601), West Cote Blanche Bay (061001), Bayou Des Glaisses Diversion channel (060207), Grand Lake (070701), Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (050702), Lake Peigneur (060909), New Iberia Southern Drainage Canal (060904) and West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee Borrow Pit Canal to be impaired by biochemical oxygen-demanding substances. Many of these waters simply have inappropriate

standards and criteria. The resources spent on developing these TMDLs could have been far more effectively and wisely spent on reviewing, approving, and assisting in the development of appropriate standards and criteria for these waters through the UAA process.

Response: TMDLs were developed for these subsegments based on the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 and the suspected causes of impairment (organic enrichment/low DO, nutrients, or ammonia) for each subsegment in the EPA Modified Court Ordered 303(d) List.

3. Remove the reference and all references to the unpublished LDEQ document, "Defaults for Uncalibrated Modeling". This is not an acceptable reference and any defaults selected on this basis must be reevaluated and based on acceptable references. Some of the models must be redone because of inappropriately selected defaults. At this time, LDEQ has no plans to revise, complete or publish this document.

Response: The unpublished LDEQ document that is mentioned here was provided to EPA's contractor without any instructions not to use it. The model coefficients listed in that document appear to be reasonable and consistent with values used in other modeling studies in southern Louisiana.

4. The percent reduction of the nonpoint source load must not be reported as an overall average of the individual percent reduction applied to each reach. This approach does not insure that standards will be met in all reaches and will be difficult to implement. In consideration of future implementation plans, LDEQ does not vary the percent reduction required from reach to reach. LDEQ uses a uniform percent reduction within a watershed unless there are unique conditions, such as a general change in landuse, that dictate a further breakdown. These unique conditions must be adequately documented in the report in order to facilitate future implementation plans. Specifying type of land use is helpful in defining nonpoint loading. LDEQ requests a calculation sheet of the NPS reduction percentages and asks that language be added to the report describing the calculation process.

Response: EPA appreciates this comment but believes that an average percent reduction is acceptable. EPA will consider this in future development of TMDLs in Louisiana.

In the lower Mermentau and Vermilion River Basins, much of the nonpoint loading affecting some of these subsegments and adding to their benthic blanket is coming from the tributaries feeding them. Many of the headwater tributaries have recent TMDL's that require dramatic percentage reductions to the nonpoint contributions. By implementing the reductions to nonpoint loads upstream, the current problems in these lower subsegments will be reduced.

Response: EPA recognizes that TMDLs have been developed upstream of several of these subsegments. Implementing upstream reductions in nonpoint loads should require much less reduction of loadings from within these subsegments. The required percent reductions for these subsegments were not intended to be in addition to upstream reductions.

5. The percentage reductions listed were not calculated based on the written procedure described in several TMDLs. These values did not take the MOS into consideration. It is also LDEQ's policy to make a no-man-made load projection run which will estimate the natural background loads. The contractor should include a no-man-made load projection run in each TMDL report.

Response: The percent reductions were calculated by subtracting the projection input value from the calibration input value and then dividing by the calibration input value. This procedure is slightly different than what LDEQ uses but still provides percent reductions that are useful.

6. CBODu and NH3-N were estimated from surrogate parameters rather than actual measured data for most of the TMDLs. Based on the measured data from the last two years of LDEQ water quality surveys, LDEQ objects to the correlation of TOC to CBOD and NH3-N to TKN, unless these correlations are taken from water quality data on the modeled waterbody. Our studies have shown only a moderate correlation between these two parameters within the same waterbody, however when this correlation was attempted across waterbodies extreme variability was seen and the correlation was not judged valid. It is possible that a combination of surrogates will obtain a better correlation, such as TOC along with color, turbidity, pH, etc. LDEQ is currently researching these options.

Response: EPA agrees that it would be ideal to have data collected from the modeled waterbody for relating TOC to CBOD and NH3-N to TKN. However, for these subsegments, there was insufficient data from which these relationships could be developed.

7. LDEQ takes exception to the equating of COD to CBODu in some of the TMDLs. There is no data to support this assumption. No direct correlation has been drawn between these two parameters. The only correlations that have been found are variable and dependant on the type of discharge. LDEQ requests that facilities with only COD limits be removed from the WLA load calculations.

Response: EPA agrees that COD is not an ideal indicator of CBODu. However, EPA believes that most effluents that exert significant COD are likely to exert some oxygen demand in natural waterbodies and therefore the discharges with COD limits should be included in the TMDLs.



8. CBODU and Org-N settling rates were not used. This is not justifiable in areas dominated by agricultural activities and is poor practice for TMDLs on Louisiana waters. The models must be revised to include settling rates.

Response: Without the use of settling rates, all of the pollutant loading remains in the water column where it can consume oxygen. Depending on the model settings for conversion of settled pollutant loading to SOD, the model can be more conservative without settling rates. Other applications of water quality models for TMDLs on southern Louisiana waterbodies have not used settling rates and have been approved by LDEQ.

9. The TMDLs should be for biochemical oxygen-demanding substances instead of DO. DO is an indicator of the impact of biochemical oxygen demanding load, hydrologic modifications, excessive algae blooms, etc.

Response: The TMDLs in Section 5 of each report are already expressed in terms of oxygen demand.

10. Nitrification inhibition option number 2 is valid for Louisiana's waterbodies. Various studies have shown that Louisiana does not have a buildup of NH<sub>3</sub>-N in its waterbodies. If option 1 was needed for a proper calibration then that should be stated as such.

Response: The nitrification inhibition option was set based on algorithms in other widely used water quality models. Option 1 has been used in other water quality modeling applications for TMDLs on southern Louisiana waterbodies that have been approved by LDEQ.

11. A winter projection model was not developed for most of the TMDLs. Winter projection models must be developed to address seasonality requirements of the Clean Water Act. Where point sources have seasonally variable effluent limitations or such seasonal variations are proposed, a winter projection model is required to show that standards are met year-round.

Response: As discussed in Section 4.2 of each report, summer is the most critical season for meeting the year round standard for DO for this subsegment. Therefore, the summer simulation satisfies the seasonality requirements of the Clean Water Act. Performing additional simulations to evaluate permit limits that are seasonal or hydrograph controlled releases was not required for developing these TMDLs and can be done by LDEQ or by permittees.

12. There was no documentation (LA-QUAL plots) to indicate that the model was calibrated to all hydrologic parameters (i.e. flow, width, depth, time of travel, velocity, chloride balance, etc.). Apparently flow balances were performed, however a flow balance is not a hydrologic calibration. Most of the models must be recalibrated with adequate hydrologic data. Calibration plots for all of the hydrologic parameters must be provided in the appendices.

Response: The values of depth, width, and flow in each model were estimated based upon the most appropriate available information. Hydraulic calibration of each model was not possible due to a lack of data.

13. The calibration and projection plots for dissolved oxygen must be provided in the body of the reports. Additional projection plots for CBODU, NH<sub>3</sub>-N, and Org-N must be provided in the appendices.

Response: The placement and number of plots in the draft reports are acceptable.

14. The calibration simulation must be used as the baseline for the sensitivity analysis, not the projection simulation. LDEQ requests that all TMDLs be revised in this regard.

Response: The sensitivity analysis can be developed using either the calibration or the projection as a baseline. EPA will consider this in future development of TMDLs in Louisiana.

15. A list of all point source dischargers must be provided in the body of the reports. Only dischargers with flows that reach the named waterbody should be included in the TMDLs.

In several TMDLs, a default 0.001 MGD flow rate was assigned to dischargers where a flow rate was not available. This practice is unacceptable to LDEQ. This default flow rate is extremely low (LDEQ would typically use 0.005 MGD as a minimum) and could strictly limit these dischargers' allowable permit loads when their permits are renewed. Additional research should be done to determine the facility type and anticipated flow rates of these facilities.

Response: The placement of the list of point source dischargers in the draft reports is acceptable. The dischargers with no flow rate information are believed to have very small flow rates representing a very small portion of the total TMDLs. The actual flow rate for each facility can be determined by LDEQ when the facility's permit is being renewed.

16. LDEQ does not agree with the minor point sources loads being subtracted from the NPS load as was done in several of the TMDLs. The pollutant loads being addressed are non-conservative loads. Many of these dischargers are located on small tributaries to the 303(d) waterbody which have recovered prior to entering into that system. Thus they are not contributing to the pollutant loads in the impaired waterbody. LDEQ's current procedure is to add these loads to the WLA portion of the TMDL.

Response: In the reports for which this comment is applicable, the TMDL calculations have been revised so that these loads are added to the WLA portion of the TMDL (same as LDEQ's procedure). For most of the draft reports, the TMDL calculations already used LDEQ's procedure of adding the minor point sources to the modeled loads.

17. Proper justification must be provided when using a nonpoint source margin of safety value other than the typical LDEQ value of 20%.

Response: The nonpoint margin of safety (MOS) was set to 10% based on other TMDLS on southern Louisiana waterbodies that have either been developed by LDEQ or approved by LDEQ. Eleven TMDL reports from LDEQ's website were reviewed to examine the explicit MOS for nonpoint sources. All 11 of these TMDLS were for oxygen demanding substances in the Mermentau or Vermilion-Teche basins. The explicit MOS for nonpoint sources was set to 20% for 2 reports, 10% for 3 reports, and 0% for 6 reports. Therefore, the value of 10% was considered to be a typical value that did not need special justification.

18. LDEQ has major concerns relating to the use of a one dimensional steady state model in coastal bays, lakes and estuaries. These systems are typically dominated by tides and winds and do not behave like riverine systems. LAQUAL can be used to simulate estuarine systems with riverine characteristics and some tidal influences; however to use it in these applications exceeds the model's recommended input limitations and appears to produce a meaningless output. Also the systems' unique hydrological characteristics do not adapt well to LAQUAL's one-dimensional capabilities. A multi-dimensional model such as WASP should be used for these waters. While a dynamic model would be preferred, a steady-state multi-dimensional model would be acceptable if it adequately addresses tidal influences. LDEQ objects to the use of LAQUAL in determining TMDLS for coastal bays, lakes and estuaries.

Response: A one dimensional steady state model such as LAQUAL was considered to be appropriate for all of these subsegments based on the amount of data that were available. Proper application of a multi-dimensional model or a dynamic model would require much more data and is simply not necessary for these waterbodies. For large, wide waterbodies, WASP will yield the same results as LAQUAL if the configuration of elements and model coefficients are the same between the two models.

19. The report uses the term synoptic survey multiple times. Please describe in detail what area this survey encompassed as well as site locations and what parameters were tested. Also, the raw data from this survey must be included in the appendices as support for the model inputs and calculations.

Response: A description of the synoptic survey and a summary of the data have been added to the appendices for each report in which those data are used.

20. In many of the calibration models the average water quality data from several LDEQ stations were used. It has been LDEQ's experience that a better calibration can be accomplished by using a single day's water quality and flow data. The additional daily values could then be used to perform multiple verifications of the model parameters before proceeding to the projection

stage. The flow data should be collected at the same time as the water quality data in order for the model to be valid.

Response: The models were calibrated to averages over multiple sampling events to minimize the effects of any single field measurement that might be of questionable quality or indicative of conditions that may have lasted only a very short time. For large systems with long residence times, using only a single snapshot of water quality data is often not representative of steady state conditions for that system.

21. Grammatical errors and misspelled words were found in these reports.

Response: The reports have been reviewed for grammar and spelling.

22. There does not appear to be any significant anthropogenic source of nutrients from agriculture, silviculture, aquaculture or urban runoff in many of these subsegments. Therefore, any occurrence of low DO is almost certainly natural. As a result, a UAA for the area is necessary to reset the DO standard. A TMDL is unwarranted for these subsegments, and LDEQ takes exception to EPA generating TMDLs which are impossible to implement.

Response: EPA is required to generate these TMDLs based on the Modified Court Ordered 303(d) List and the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and regulations at 40 CFR 130.7.

23. LDEQ's nutrient standard is based on total phosphorus (TP) and total nitrogen (TN), not total inorganic nitrogen (TIN). Since phosphorus is not the limiting constituent in Louisiana, the nutrient allocations must be in terms of TN and only TN.

Response: LDEQ's nutrient standard (LAC 33:IX.1113.B.8) does not specify that nitrogen to phosphorus ratios should be based on total nitrogen. However, EPA will consider this in future development of TMDLs in Louisiana.

In the coastal areas, the nitrogen to phosphorus ratio used was based on freshwater streams and is not applicable to brackish Gulf waters. LDEQ takes exception to the calculation of a TMDL based on TN/TP ratios derived from waterbodies other than the modeled waterbody. It is LDEQ's experience that the natural allowable TN/TP ratio is waterbody-specific and can vary dramatically between streams.

Response: EPA agrees that it would be ideal to have a large database of nitrogen to phosphorus ratios for each waterbody. However, because these subsegments have only limited nutrient data, the previously developed nitrogen to phosphorus ratio that was used in the draft reports is considered acceptable.

LDEQ has not adopted the EPA recommended ammonia criteria (1999) and takes exception to its use in this TMDL. In general, LDEQ does not accept EPA's use of national guidance for TMDL endpoints. The nationally recommended criteria do not consider regional or site-specific conditions or species and may be inappropriately over protective or under protective. No ammonia nitrogen toxicity has been demonstrated or documented in any of the waterbodies in these TMDLs. The general criteria (in particular, LAC 33:IX.1113.B.5) require state waters be free from the effects of toxic substances.

Response: Ammonia TMDLs were developed for two subsegments based on the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and regulations at 40 CFR 130.7 and the fact that the Modified Court Ordered 303(d) List included ammonia as a suspected cause of impairment for those two subsegments. National guidance for ammonia toxicity was used in the absence of any numerical state water quality standards for ammonia.

24. The implicit margin-of-safety must not be quantified.

Response: The text of the reports has been revised to eliminate any quantification of the implicit margin of safety.

25. EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES: Add summary tables of the WLAs, LAs, and TMDLs showing the allocations and margins of safety.

Response: The summary tables of the WLAs, LAs, and TMDLs can be easily found in Section 5 of each report and do not need to be repeated in the executive summary.

26. Temperature Correction of Kinetics: A temperature correction factor was set for reaeration. It is LDEQ's standard practice to allow LAQUAL to calculate this factor. There is more guidance on this in the LAQUAL User's Manual.

Response: The temperature correction factor for reaeration was set to the value of 1.024 based on guidance in Section 3.3.8 of the LTP.

27. Water Quality Kinetics: The Louisiana reaeration equation was used on reaches that are outside the maximum depth that it was designed for. A more appropriate reaeration equation must be selected.

Response: The Louisiana equation yielded reaeration coefficients that appeared more reasonable than coefficients from other equations.

28. Water Quality standards and designated uses tables did not include the BAC (bacterial criteria) values.

Response: The water quality standards for bacteria are not relevant for these TMDLs.

29. The statement was made in the Initial Conditions paragraphs in several of the reports that temperature was specified because the temperature was not being simulated. The section then states, "For constituents not being simulated, the initial concentrations were set to zero ...". Initial conditions provide a starting point for the iterative solution of modeled constituents. They also provide values for constituents that are needed as input but are not being simulated.

Response: EPA appreciates this comment.

30. Several reports describe the benthic ammonia source rate as a calibration parameter; however a review of the data type 13 calibration input section indicates a value of zero for this parameter, in all reaches.

Response: The benthic ammonia source rate was used as a calibration parameter; the value of that parameter that provided the best fit between predicted and observed values was zero.

31. Calibration, and Projection, Data type 27: A salinity value was set to zero in the boundary conditions for both the calibration and the projection models in several of the TMDLs. With this value set to zero the model will automatically adjust the values of the lowest reach's elements to the value set in the boundary conditions. Since most of the models were one-reach, one-element models, the model automatically set the element salinity to zero, thus calculating an inaccurate value for the DO saturation.

Response: The only models where salinity was set to zero in the downstream boundary conditions were those models where salinity was not considered high enough to have a significant impact on DO saturation.

32. It is not LDEQ's standard procedure to use a zero headwater flow. You may not have input a headwater flow, but the model did. Without a headwater flow the model would have crashed and not run. The model's programming allows for a 0.0000001 cms flow rate when the modeler has not input a headwater flow.

Response: Only two simulations (calibrations for Spanish Lake and Big Constance Lake) used a zero headwater flow. For all practical purposes, 0.0000001 m<sup>3</sup>/sec is the same as zero flow.

33. Hydraulics and Dispersion: The use of constant widths and depths requires proper justification.

Response: The widths and depths were justified in Section 3 of each report.

34. Several reports state that algae were not simulated because algae did not appear to have

significant impacts. What was the evidence for this statement? Did the contractor have any Chlorophyll a measurements?

Response: This statement was based on general knowledge of the Mermentau and Vermilion-Teche basins as well as a limited amount of diurnal DO data collected in these basins.

---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS FROM LDEQ FOR BAYOU CHENE:

### A. BAYOU CHENE DO .PDF

1. 3.6 Water Quality Kinetics: The only dispersion addressed in this model was tidal dispersion in the very last reach. Advective dispersion was not addressed at all. It would have been appropriate to address advective dispersion in the other 8 reaches of this model.

Response: EPA appreciates this response.

2. 3.6 Water Quality Kinetics: The default minimum KL used for the LAQUAL model is 1.97/depth which is the Texas default. This default was kept so that old models would run correctly. It would be more appropriate to use the Louisiana default of 2.3/depth in this model.

Response: Since the default minimum KL of 1.97/depth is more conservative, it is acceptable.

3. 4.0 Water Quality Model Projection: Projection runs done at the proposed standards are needed. The TMDL would then remain applicable after a UAA is performed and promulgated.

Response: EPA is required to develop TMDLs using existing DO standards. If the DO standard for this subsegment changes the TMDL can be adjusted as part of the TMDL process.

---

## LDEQ COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT TMDL FOR:

### BAYOU CHENE TMDL FOR DISSOLVED OXYGEN SUBSEGMENTS 050603

#### TMDL COMMENTS:

1. 2.2 Water Quality Standards: A "No-Load" run would be helpful in building a case for changing the standards.

Response: EPA appreciates this comment.

2. 3.3 Temperature Correction of Kinetics: A temperature correction factor was set for reaeration. It is LDEQ's standard practice to allow Laqual to calculate this factor. There is more guidance on this in the Laqual User's Manual.

Response: The temperature correction factor for reaeration was set to the value of 1.024 based on guidance in Section 3.3.8 of the LTP.

3. 3.4 Hydraulics and Dispersion: The use of constant widths and depths requires proper justification.

Response: The widths and depths were justified in Section 3.4 of the report.

4. 3.6 Water Quality Kinetics: The Louisiana reaeration equation was used on reaches that are outside the maximum depth that it was designed for. A more appropriate reaeration equation must be selected.

Response: The Louisiana equation yielded reaeration coefficients that appeared more reasonable than coefficients from other equations.

5. 3.6 Water Quality Kinetics: No settling rates were used in this model. With the large amount of agriculture present, this model must address settling.

Response: Without the use of settling rates, all of the pollutant loading remains in the water column where it can consume oxygen. Depending on the model settings for conversion of settled pollutant loading to SOD, the model can be more conservative without settling rates. Other applications of water quality models for TMDLs on southern Louisiana waterbodies have not used settling rates and have been approved by LDEQ.

6. 3.6 Water Quality Kinetics: The default minimum KL used for the Laqual model is 1.97/depth which is the Texas default. This default was kept so that old models would run correctly. It would be more appropriate to use the Louisiana default of 2.3/depth in this model.

Response: See response to this comment above.

7. 4.8 Model Results for Projection: The TMDL should not address an average percent reduction for nonpoint source. It is LDEQ's position that best management practices should be addressed throughout the entire watershed to share equitably the responsibility of reducing nonpoint loading and not just at the bottom of the watershed where it typically shows up in large quantities. Therefore it would be our standard practice to have the same percent reduction for all reaches. However, for this waterbody it may be appropriate to address reach 9 separately



from the other 8 reaches because it appears to be predominately marsh. The other 8 reaches appear to be predominately agriculture and should have a uniform reduction.

Response: EPA appreciates this comment but believes that an average percent reduction is acceptable. EPA will consider this in future development of TMDLs in Louisiana.

8. 4.8 Model Results for Projection : It is LDEQ's standard practice to address a background loading. This model does not address background loading.

Response: EPA appreciates the comment.

9. 5.4 Margin of Safety: Implied margin of safety should not be quantified.

Response: The text of the report has been revised to eliminate quantification of the implicit margin of safety.

10. 4.0 Water Quality Model Projection: Projection runs done at the proposed standards are needed. The TMDL would then remain applicable after a UAA is performed and promulgated.

Response: See response to this comment above.

11. 4.0 Water Quality Model Projection: The Clean Water Act requires that seasonal variations be addressed. Therefore, a winter projection run is needed.

Response: As discussed in Section 4.2, summer is the most critical season for meeting the year round standard for DO for this subsegment. Therefore, the summer simulation satisfies the seasonality requirements of the Clean Water Act. Performing additional simulations to evaluate permit limits that are seasonal or hydrograph controlled releases was not required for developing these TMDLs and can be done by LDEQ or by permittees.

---

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY (LSU) AG CENTER  
(some of these comments may not apply to this report):

Through this letter the Louisiana State University AgCenter would like to submit official comments on TMDLs for dissolved oxygen and nutrients associated allocations for waterbodies in:

- Vermilion River Cutoff
- Bayou Chene
- Bayou Petite Anse
- Bayou Tigre
- Big Constance Lake and Mermentau Coastal Bays and Gulf Water

- Charenton Drainage and Navigation Canal and West Cote Blanche Bay
- Chatlin Lake Canal/Bayou Du Lac and Bayou Des Glaisses Diversion Channel
- Dugas Canal
- Franklin Canal
- Freshwater Bayou Canal
- Irish Ditch/Big Bayou
- Lake Arthur, Grand Lake, and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
- Lake Peigneur
- New Iberia Southern Drainage Canal
- Spanish Lake
- Tete Bayou
- Bayou Carron
- West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee Borrow Pit Canal

The number of different TMDLs sent out for comment at the same time may overwhelm the public's ability to comment. With only 30 days to prepare and submit comments it is impossible for a qualified faculty member to review the supporting data in depth and attend to his(her) official responsibilities. I realize that the agency is under time constraints on completing these, but I earnestly request that more time per proposed TMDL be given in the future.

We must make several other general comments and objections that apply to most of the proposed TMDLs. In many cases the data used to calibrate the models for the stream segments was collected in the fall of 2000 near the end of a three year drought. Historic low flows were often commented on in the text of the TMDL. Low flows result in a biased estimate of the natural ability of the stream to reaerate and cleanse itself of pollutants. Low flows also enable the benthic blanket to accumulate and remain in place undisturbed causing overstatement of the benthic oxygen demand and the SOD which were in many cases the primary oxygen demand loads in the stream. While it is true that the high flows that come from storm events carry more organic and sediment loads into the stream, the high flow rates also scour material from the bottoms and move it on to a final deposit at the stream terminus. It was thus that most of Louisiana and all of our coastal areas were built. Prolonged drought conditions do not allow this natural cleansing to occur. Thus it is our belief that the part of the oxygen demand load attributed to benthic and sediments is overstated and that new data must be collected during normal rainfall conditions and the models re-calibrated.

Response: The Louisiana water quality standards are applicable during all flow conditions greater than the 7Q10. Because 7Q10 flow is frequently the most critical condition for maintaining the DO standard, it is desirable to collect field data for model calibration during times when the hydrology is as close as possible to 7Q10 conditions. It is believed that the flow conditions for these waterbodies may have been near 7Q10 conditions, but probably not lower than 7Q10 flows. Therefore, the summer-fall 1998 data is desirable for model calibration.

In far too many of the proposed TMDLs the phrase *"an intensive field survey was not conducted for the study area due to schedule and budget limitations"* was found. If municipalities, agriculture, and business entities are to be asked to make large commitments of funds, time and effort to resolve our water quality problems they deserve to have the benefit of a serious study of the problem. We request that all of the proposed TMDLs that contain this statement have this problem corrected and that TMDLs be prepared based on complete studies.

Response: There is no requirement for collecting a certain amount of data to make a TMDL valid. If additional data are collected in the future by LDEQ, other agencies, or local stakeholders, then those data can be evaluated at the time and the implementation of the TMDL can be altered as necessary. As outlined in the 1991 EPA document titled "Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process", developing and implementing TMDLs is a process and not a one-time event.

In several of the proposed TMDLs data was used that is 9 or 10 years old from studies on point source discharges. While the data is probably high quality it assumes that no change in the plant or its load have occurred in the last decade. This assumption may not be defensible. In the TMDLs where a treatment plant was included in the model the margin of error was calculated by using 125% of the design capacity. This assumes a plant will perform at the same level when it is operated in excess of its design load. This assumption is also questionable.

Response: For several subsegments, old data sets were used for calibration because they provided more extensive data than newer data sets. However, all of the projection runs simulated point source discharges based on the most recent information available. Simulating point source discharges at 125% of design flow is simply a way of incorporating an explicit margin of safety and does not assume that the facility can actually treat that much wastewater.

The standard for dissolved oxygen (DO) was held at 5 mg/L in some streams on a year round basis, even if it received or discharged into a stream with 5 mg/L winter and 2 or 3 mg/l summer standards. Other streams had a year DO oxygen standard of 4 mg/L. We strongly suggest that a review be made of the DO standards for all of the streams in south Louisiana that are shallow, sluggish, and subject to tidal influence and that uniform standards be set. In view of the remarks that achieving a DO of 5 mg/L was impossible in some of the streams that had little loading from human activities, we believe that the summer standard of 2 mg/L is much more applicable to these streams.

Response: The TMDLs are required to be developed for the existing DO standard, which is 5 mg/L year round for many of these subsegments. If the DO standard is revised in the future for any of these subsegments, the TMDL and implementation can be altered as necessary as part of the TMDL process.

Many of these TMDLs were drafted by an out of state contractor and do not appear to be as well researched as those drafted by LDEQ. Very little data was included in the contractor drafted TMDLs summaries as compared to the ones prepared by or in conjunction with LDEQ. Additionally, the bulk of the text appeared to be standard wording in all documents with short relevant inserts. We would request that if outside contractors be used in future TMDL assessments that they be held to the same standard of information inclusion that LDEQ provides. Stream diagrams and maps are often needed when reviewing descriptive text on stream location, tributary insert, and exact location.

Response: These TMDLs contain all the required components of a TMDL and the level of detail is considered acceptable. Because these TMDLs could not be funded at the same level as most of LDEQ's DO TMDLs, the analysis and documentation was not as extensive as most of LDEQ's DO TMDLs. However, some of the information that was mentioned in the comment (stream diagrams and maps) was included in the reports, but they were placed in the appendices (which were available from EPA upon request).